



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/992,018	11/26/2001	Jun Tanaka	500.39756CX1	1254
20457	7590	03/10/2003	EXAMINER	
ANTONELLI TERRY STOUT AND KRAUS SUITE 1800 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22209			NGUYEN, DUNG T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2871	
DATE MAILED: 03/10/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

In

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/992,018	TANAKA ET AL.
	Examiner Dung Nguyen	Art Unit 2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 November 2001.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 3,4,7,8,10 and 13-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 3,4,7,8,10 and 13-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 November 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on 11/26/2001 is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/797,720.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>3</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d).

The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 09/797,720, filed on 03/05/2001.

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: reference numbers 25 and 26. A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the external electrode terminal is covered with the inorganic insulating layer, is covered with at least one of the lower light-transmission flattened layer and the upper light-transmission protection layer (claims 15-16) must be shown or the features canceled from the claims. No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 3 and 4 recite the limitation "said color liquid crystal panel" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

3. Claim 15 recites the limitation "said upper light-transmission" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

4. Claims 18 and 19 recite the limitation "said upper light-transmission" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1. Claims 3-4, 7-8, 10 and 13-20 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 5-6, 9 and 11-12 of copending Application No. 09/797,720. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both applications disclose a same color liquid crystal display (LCD) apparatus. In particular, the subject matter claimed in the instant application pertains to the embodiment in figures 1-3 and the accompanying relevant text, of

both the copending application and the instant application, and covered by claims 5-6, 9 and 11-12 in the copending application. The difference between the instant application claims and the copending application claims is that pixel electrode is driven by thin film transistor (TFT) elements and liquid crystal is driven by a voltage applied between the pixel electrode and common electrode. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to drive a pixel electrode by TFT element (i.e., TFT switching) as well as apply a voltage between the pixel electrode and common electrode in order to operate an active matrix liquid crystal display device. In addition, regarding claims 15 and 16, the limitation of an external electrode terminal being covered with an inorganic insulating layer and upper light-transmission protection layer would have been obvious to one skilled in the art because it is a common practice in the art to reduce the manufacturing time since only a single process is needed to form protective layers (e.g., insulating and/or upper light-transmission) on both a display area (i.e. pixel region) and a drive circuit area (e.g., external electrode terminal).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kadota et al. (US Patent 5,818,550) disclose a color LCD device (figure 1) in which a color filter comprising a primary color filter (9B, 9G, 9R) and an upper light transmission protection layer (10) that formed between a pixel electrode (1) and an insulating layer (5).

Yamamoto et al. (US Patent 6,445,432) disclose a color LCD device (figure 2) in which a color filter comprising a primary color filter (10) and an upper light transmission protection layer (14) that formed between a pixel electrode (15) and an insulating layer (9).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-0423. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H. Kim can be reached on 703-305-3492. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7726 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

DN
03/04/2003



Dung Nguyen
Patent Examiner
GAU 2871